arXiv:1510.06448v1 [math.PR] 21 Oct 2015

SPECTRAL DENSITY FOR RANDOM MATRICES WITH INDEPENDENT SKEW-DIAGONALS

KRISTINA SCHUBERT

Abstract. We consider the empirical eigenvalue distribution of random real symmetric matrices with stochastically independent skew-diagonals and study its limit if the matrix size tends to infinity. We allow correlations between entries on the same skew-diagonal and we distinguish between two types of such correlations, a rather weak and a rather strong one. For weak correlations the limiting distribution is Wigner's semi-circle distribution; for strong correlations it is the free convolution of the semi-circle distribution and the limiting distribution for random Hankel matrices.

1. Introduction

Wigner's semi-circle law is possibly the most famous principle in random matrix theory. It states that, for various random matrix ensembles, the empirical eigenvalue distribution tends to a universal limit if the matrix size tends to infinity. The most prominent representatives of ensembles following this law are the three classical Gaussian Ensembles (GOE, GUE and GSE) and the more general Wigner ensembles. The latter maintain the independence of the matrix entries of the classical Gaussian ensembles, but allow other distributions than the normal distribution.

The proof of Wigner's semi-circle law started with the pioneering works of Wigner himself [20, 21] and experienced many generalizations, e.g. by Arnold [2]. This proof was recently accomplished for Wigner ensembles under rather mild regularity assumptions in a series of papers by Tao and Vu [18, 19] and Erdős et al. (see e.g. the survey [8]). The law states that the empirical eigenvalue distribution in Wigner ensembles converges weakly, in probability, to a non-random distribution, if the matrix size tends to infinity. The limiting distribution is then given by the semi-circle distribution.

The appearance of this distribution in the limit of large matrix sizes, regardless of the distribution of the matrix entries, hints at a phenomenon often encountered in the study of random matrices, called universality. In general, the universality principle describes the fact that several limiting distributions of eigenvalue statistics do not depend on the details of the underlying random matrix ensemble.

However, one may ask to which extent the independence of the matrix entries is necessary for the limiting spectral density to be the semi-circle and how this limit changes if not all matrix entries are independent. Hence, matrices with a dependence structure of some kind have attracted attention over the last years and were e.g. studied in [5, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16].

One possible approach to matrices with correlated real-valued entries is to allow that entries on the same (skew-)diagonal are correlated, while entries on different (skew-)diagonals are independent. The most distinct type of such correlations is met by random Toeplitz matrices T_n and random Hankel matrices H_n, given by

$$T_n \coloneqq [X_{|i-j|}]_{1\leq i,j\leq n}, \quad H_n \coloneqq [X_{i+j-1}]_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60B20.

for real-valued random variables $X_0, \dots, X_{2n-1}$. These matrices appear e.g. as autocovariance matrices in time series analysis and as information matrices in a polynomial regression model [3]. The study of random Toeplitz and Hankel matrices was proposed by Bai [3] and later addressed by Bryc, Dembo and Jiang [7]. It was shown that if $X_0, \dots, X_{2n-1}$ have variance one, the empirical eigenvalue distributions of T_n and H_n converge weakly with probability one to non-random limits. In particular, both limits differ from the semi-circle distribution and hence oppose the universality results for classical ensembles with independent entries. Starting from the results for Toeplitz matrices, matrices with independent diagonals have been studied by Friesen and Löwe [9, 10].

In this paper, we consider the empirical eigenvalue distribution of real symmetric random matrices with independent skew-diagonals instead of independent diagonals. We assume that each matrix entry is centered with the same variance and that the k-th moments are uniformly bounded for all matrix sizes. Our main results state that the empirical eigenvalue distribution converges weakly, with probability one, to a non-random distribution. Here, we distinguish two ensembles, one allowing for weak correlations, the other one allowing for strong correlations.

By weak correlations, we mean that the covariance of two entries on the same skew-diagonal depends on their distance only and decays sufficiently fast. In this case, we show that the limiting spectral density is given by the semi-circle. When we consider a type of rather strong correlations between entries on the same skew-diagonal, we assume that these correlations depend on the matrix size only and converge as the matrix size tends to infinity. Here, the limiting spectral distribution is given by a combination of the semi-circle distribution and the limiting distribution for Hankel matrices. Both distributions are obtained in special cases, where the correlation of two entries on the same skew-diagonal tends to zero or to one respectively. These results are analogue to the ones obtained for ensembles of matrices with independent diagonals in [9, 10].

In our proof, we can follow the basic ideas of [7, 9, 10], while several technical difficulties arise for the current ensembles, preventing the results of [9, 10] from being directly applicable. To gain insight into these difficulties, we note that the basic tool in the study of the expected empirical distribution, both in the setting of [9, 10] and in the current setting, is the method of moments. Hence, for an $n \times n$ random matrix $X_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(a_n(i,j))_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$ we need to consider the k-th expected moment of the empirical eigenvalue distribution, which is given by

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{tr}(X_n^k)\right] = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{p_1,\dots,p_k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[a_n(p_1,p_2)a_n(p_2,p_3)\dots a_n(p_k,p_1)\right]. \tag{1.1}$$

To calculate (1.1), we have to consider the (in)dependence structure of the matrix entries: For the ensembles in [9, 10] two entries $a_n(i,j)$ and $a_n(i',j')$ are stochastically independent if neither they nor $a_n(j,i)$ and $a_n(i',j')$ are on the same diagonal, i.e. if

$$|i-j| \neq |i'-j'|. \tag{1.2}$$

For the current ensembles with independent skew-diagonals, entries $a_n(i,j)$ and $a_n(i',j')$ are stochastically independent if

$$i+j \neq i'+j'. \tag{1.3}$$

Although the defining relations (1.2) and (1.3) appear quite similar, the implications are more involved leading to two major difficulties.

Firstly, a key observation for the calculation of (1.1) in [9, 10] are the general equations $\sum_{i=1}^{k}(p_i - p_{i+1}) = 0$ (as $k+1$ is identified with 1) and $\sum_{i=l}^{m}(p_i - p_{i+1}) = p_l -$

p_{m+1}. However, the appearance of the differences $p_i - p_{i+1}$ makes these equations well applicable to ensembles with independence structure (1.2) in contrast to ensembles with independence structure (1.3). This leads to the most prominent difference, Lemma 4.4, which states that a certain quantity vanishes as the matrix size n tends to infinity rather than being zero for all n as in the analogue result in [10].

Secondly, the usual symmetry condition $a_n(i,j) = a_n(j,i)$ affects the matrix ensembles with independent diagonals and independent skew-diagonals in different ways. An $n \times n$ matrix is built from n independent families of random variables in the first case (one for each diagonal in the upper triangular matrix) and from $2n-1$ independent families in the second case (one for the upper half of each skew-diagonal) respectively. This apparent 'higher degree of independence' does however not favor the analysis. Instead, when in the course of the calculations we consider pairs of matrix entries on the same skew-diagonal, say $a_n(i,j)$, $a_n(i+c, j-c)$, we have to explicitly treat such pairs, where the symmetry of the matrix implies $a_n(i,j) = a_n(i+c, j-c)$, i.e. $c = j - i$ (see Lemma 4.3 onward).

For the convenience of the reader, we follow the line of arguments presented in [9, 10]. We adapt the proofs to the current ensembles and insert new ideas when necessary. More detailed comments on the differences between the methods in [9, 10] and the methods in this paper are given in Remark 5.5.

Matrices from the ensembles considered in this paper and in [9, 10] can actually be generated in several ways. Ensembles with weak correlations along the (skew-)diagonals can e.g. be built from independent families of stationary Gaussian Markov processes with mean zero and variance one. One can also fill the independent (skew-)diagonals with random variables from the Curie-Weiss model with inverse temperature $\beta > 0$. These exhibit the required strong correlations and for $\beta > 1$ the limiting law is the described combination of the semi-circle distribution and the limiting law for Toeplitz matrices or for Hankel matrices respectively. The phase transition at $\beta = 1$ in the Curie-Weiss model corresponds to the fact that for $\beta \leq 1$ the limiting law is the semi-circle distribution. Details on these examples can be found in [9, 10].

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we introduce our model of matrices with independent skew-diagonals and two different conditions for the correlations on the same skew-diagonal. Moreover, we state our main results (Theorem 2.2 and 2.3) about the convergence of the empirical eigenvalue distribution. In Section 3, following the ideas of [7], we introduce the notion of partitions to model the dependence structure of the matrix entries and derive an intermediate result for the expected k-th moment of the empirical eigenvalue distribution; this calculation is completed in Section 4. In Section 5 we extend the convergence of the expected k-th moment of the empirical eigenvalue distribution to the required weak convergence with probability one. In the case of strong correlations we further show some results for the limiting distribution. In particular, we show that the limiting distribution is the free convolution of the semi-circle distribution and the limiting distribution for Hankel matrices.

2. Main Results

We introduce our ensembles of random matrices and then state our main theorems. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we let $a_n(p,q)$ with $1 \leq p \leq q \leq n$ denote real random variables. We will consider the eigenvalues of the symmetric random $n \times n$ matrix X_n obtained from

$a_n(p,q)_{1\le p\le q\le n}$ by rescaling

$$X_n(p,q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} a_n(p,q), \quad 1 \le p \le q \le n,$$
$$X_n(p,q) = X_n(q,p), \qquad 1 \le q < p \le n.$$

We suppose that the random variables $a_n(p,q)$ are centered with variance one and the k-th moments are uniformly bounded. Moreover, we assume that the skew-diagonals are independent. Technically, these assumptions read:

(A1)
$$\mathbb{E}(a_n(p,q)) = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}((a_n(p,q)^2) = 1, \quad 1 \le p \le q \le n$$

(A2)
$$m_k \coloneqq \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \max_{1\le p\le q\le n} \mathbb{E}\left(|a_n(p,q)|^k\right) < \infty$$

(A3) The families $\{a_n(p,q) : p+q = r\}$ are independent for $r = 2, 3, \dots, 2n$.

We will consider two types of matrices with different conditions on the covariances of entries from the same skew-diagonal. On the one hand, we assume that these covariances depend on the distance of the entries and decay sufficiently fast. On the other hand, we assume that these covariances are constant (only depending on n) and that they converge as $n \to \infty$. These conditions are

(C1) There exists a function $c_n : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

(i) for $p \le q, r \le s$ with $p+q = r+s$ we have
$$|\mathrm{Cov}(a_n(p,q), a_n(r,s))| = c_n(|p-r|) = c_n(|q-s|).$$

(ii) For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have
$$\sum_{\tau=0}^{n-1} c_n(\tau) = o(n).$$

(C2) There exists $(c_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that for all $p, p', q, q' \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $p+q = p'+q'$ and $(p,q) \notin \{(p',q'), (q',p')\}$ we have:
$$\mathrm{Cov}(a_n(p,q), a_n(p',q')) = c_n.$$
Moreover, the limit $c \coloneqq \lim_{n\to\infty} c_n < \infty$ exists.

Remark 2.1. If condition (C2) is satisfied, we have $0 \le c \le 1$ (see Remark 2.1 in [9]). Indeed, $0 \le c$ is a consequence of

$$0 \le \mathbb{V}\left(\sum_{p=1}^{n} a_n(p,p)\right) = n + n(n-1)c_n$$

and $c_n \le 1$ is a consequence of Hölder's inequality.

For the ordered eigenvalues of a matrix X_n, denoted by $\lambda_1^{(n)} \le \dots \le \lambda_n^{(n)}$, we introduce the empirical eigenvalue distribution

$$\mu_n(X_n) \coloneqq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \delta_{\lambda_k^{(n)}}.$$

Our main theorems then state the weak convergence of μ_n under condition (C1) resp. under (C2). If (C1) is satisfied, the limiting distribution is Wigner's semi-circle distribution.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that (A1), (A2), (A3) and (C1) are satisfied. Then, with probability one, μ_n converges weakly to the standard semi-circle distribution μ with density*

$$\frac{d\mu}{dx}\frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{4-x^2}\,\chi_{[-2,2]}(x). \tag{2.4}$$

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that (A1), (A2), (A3) and (C2) are satisfied. Then, with probability one, μ_n converges weakly to a non-random probability measure ν_c. The limiting measure ν_c does not depend on the distribution of the random variables $a_n(p,q)$.*

If condition (C2) is satisfied, we can show further results for v_c.

Theorem 2.4. *In the situation of Theorem 2.3, the limiting measure v_c, $0 \le c \le 1$, is the free convolution of the measures $v_{0,1-c}$ and $v_{1,c}$, we write $v_c = v_{0,1-c} \boxplus v_{1,c}$. Here, $v_{0,1-c}$ denotes the rescaled semi-circle with variance $1-c$ and $v_{1,c}$ the rescaled measure for Hankel matrices γ_H with variance c as derived in* [7]*. Moreover, v_c is a symmetric measure. If $c > 0$, v_c has an unbounded support, and if $0 \le c < 1$, its density is smooth.*

Remark 2.5. Here, neither the notion of free probability nor of the free convolution is introduced and the reader is referred to [15] for details on this topic. We observe that the result of Theorem 2.4 is in good accordance with the semi-circle law and the results of [7]. Indeed, on the one hand, matrices from the GOE satisfy (C2) with $c = 0$, indicating no dependence at all, and hence v_0 has to be the semi-circle distribution. On the other hand, random Hankel matrices satisfy (C2) with $c = 1$ and thus we conclude that v_1 equals γ_H in [7]. This also becomes apparent in our calculations of the moments of v_c, where it turns out that the moments of v_0 are exactly given by the moments of the semi-circle distribution and the moments of v_1 are given by the moments of γ_H (see Remark 5.1).

3. Preliminaries, Notation and Combinatorics

Following the suggestions of [7, 9, 10], we will prove Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 by the method of moments. In order to calculate the k-th moment of the expected empirical distribution μ_n, we introduce some notation and some combinatorial arguments that will repeatedly be used in the proofs. We can expand

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\int x^k d\mu_n(X_n)\right] &= \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{tr}(X_n^k)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}}\sum_{p_1,\dots,p_k=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(p_1,p_2)a_n(p_2,p_3)\dots a_n(p_k,p_1)\right].\end{aligned}$$

To simplify the notation we set

$$\tau_n(k) \coloneqq \{(P_1,\dots,P_k) : P_j = (p_j,q_j) \in \{1,\dots,n\}^2, q_j = p_{j+1}\}.$$

Hence, in the expansion of the k-th moment we write $a_n(P_i)$ instead of $a_n(p_i,p_{i+1})$ for $P_i = (p_i,p_{i+1})$ and we sum over all $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in \tau_n(k)$. Throughout this paper, we identify $k+1$ with 1.

In order to display the dependence structure of the matrix entries, we use the notion of partitions as suggested by [7]. We want to express that $a_n(P_i)$ and $a_n(P_j)$ are not stochastically independent, i.e. they denote entries on the same skew-diagonal, by i and j being in the same block of the corresponding partition. More precisely, for a partition π of $\{1,\dots,k\}$ we call $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in \tau_n(k)$ a *π-consistent sequence* if

$$p_i + q_i = p_j + q_j \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad i \sim j. \tag{3.5}$$

We write $i \sim j$ instead of $i \sim_\pi j$ if the partition π can be recovered from the context. With

$$\mathcal{P}(k) \coloneqq \{\pi : \pi \text{ is a partition of } \{1,\dots,k\}\},$$
$$S_n(\pi) \coloneqq \{(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in \tau_n(k) : (P_1,\dots,P_k) \text{ is } \pi\text{-consistent}\}, \quad \pi \in \mathcal{P}(k),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{p_1,\dots,p_k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[a_n(p_1,p_2)a_n(p_2,p_3)\dots a_n(p_k,p_1)\right] \\ = \;& \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}(k)} \sum_{(P_1,\dots,P_k)\in S_n(\pi)} \mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_1)a_n(P_2)\dots a_n(P_k)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Here, we used that the sets $S_n(\pi), \pi \in \mathcal{P}(k)$, are a partition of $\tau_n(k)$. In the next subsection we argue that it is only the pair partitions that give a non-vanishing contribution in (3.6).

3.1. **Reduction to pair partitions.** We observe that in (3.6) terms corresponding to partitions π with more than $\frac{k}{2}$ blocks, i.e. $\#\pi > \frac{k}{2}$, vanish, since in this case there is a partition block with a single element i. Hence, $a_n(P_i)$ is independent of all the other $a_n(P_j), j \neq i$ if $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi)$ and as $a_n(P_i)$ is centered (see (A1)) the respective term equals zero. We claim that for partitions with less than $k/2$ blocks we have

$$\frac{\#S_n(\pi)}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} = o(1), \quad \#\pi < \frac{k}{2}. \tag{3.7}$$

This can be seen from the following combinatorial arguments used to determine the number of possibilities to construct an element $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi)$:

- Once $P_i = (p_i, p_{i+1})$ is fixed, the pair $P_{i+1} = (p_{i+1}, p_{i+2})$ is determined by the choice of p_{i+2}.
- We start with the choice of $P_1 = (p_1, p_2)$, for which there are at most n^2 possibilities.
- We proceed sequentially to determine $P_2, P_3, \dots$ as follows: To determine P_i, if i is in the same block of π as some preceding index $j \in \{1,\dots,i-1\}$, there is no choice left, as the indices need to satisfy $p_j + p_{j+1} = p_i + p_{i+1}$, where p_j, p_{j+1}, p_i are already known. Otherwise, there are at most n possible choices. Once P_1 is fixed, there are n possibilities for each 'new' partition block, i.e. $\#\pi - 1$ times.

Hence, we obtain $\#S_n(\pi) \leq n^2 \cdot n^{\#\pi-1} = n^{\#\pi+1}$, proving the claim in (3.7). Together with

$$|\mathbb{E}[a_n(P_1)\dots a_n(P_k)]| \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left[\mathbb{E}|a_n(P_i)|^k\right]^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq m_k,$$

which is a consequence of the uniform boundedness of the moments in (A2) and Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{tr} X_n^k\right] = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{\substack{\pi\in\mathcal{P}(k)\\ \#\pi=\frac{k}{2}}} \sum_{(P_1,\dots,P_k)\in S_n(\pi)} \mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_1)a_n(P_2)\dots a_n(P_k)\right] + o(1). \tag{3.8}$$

In particular, the odd moments vanish. Moreover, it suffices to consider pair partitions π in (3.8), i.e. partitions where each block has exactly two elements. Indeed, partitions with $\#\pi = \frac{k}{2}$ that are not pair partitions contain a block with a single element and do hence not contribute to (3.8) by the same reasoning that allowed us to exclude partitions with $\#\pi > \frac{k}{2}$.

3.2. **Partitions and combinatorics.** We sum up some combinatorial arguments about partitions and introduce some notation. A recurring combinatorial consideration is the following: Suppose we want to determine the number of possible vectors $(P_1, \dots, P_k) \in S_n(\pi)$ or parts of this vector for a given pair partition π. We write $P_i = (p_i, p_{i+1}), i = 1, \dots, k$ and state two counting principles:

(CP1) Assume that only p_i is already fixed for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and we want to choose values for $p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{j+1}$ for some $j > i$ (i.e. we want to fix $P_i, \dots, P_j$). We start with the choice of p_{i+1}, for which there are n possibilities. Then, we proceed sequentially to fix $p_{i+2}, p_{i+3}, \dots$ and for each p_l we have n choices if l is not in the same block as any of the $i, i+1, \dots, l-1$. Otherwise there is no choice and p_l is already determined by the requirement of π-consistency. Hence, if r denotes the number of blocks that are occupied by $\{i, \dots, j\}$, we have n^r possibilities to fix $P_i, \dots, P_j$ (for given p_i).

(CP2) As in (CP1) we want to choose values for $p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{j+1}$ for some $j > i$ (i.e. we want to fix $P_i, \dots, P_j$) and we assume that in addition to p_i some values $P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_l}$ with $\{i_1, \dots, i_l\} \cap \{i, \dots, j\} = \emptyset$ have already been fixed. Again, we start with the choice of p_{i+1}. If $i+1$ is not equivalent to any of the $i_1, \dots, i_l$, there are n possibilities, otherwise p_{i+1} is already fixed by the π-consistency. For p_{i+2} there are n possibilities if $i+2$ is not equivalent to any of the indices $i+1, i_1, \dots, i_l$, otherwise there is no choice. Proceeding sequentially, we have n^{r-s} possibilities to fix $P_i, \dots, P_j$ if r denotes the number of partition blocks that are occupied by $\{i, \dots, j\}$ and s denotes the number of indices in $\{i, \dots, j\}$ that are equivalent to any of the $i_1, \dots, i_l$. In other words, $r - s$ is the number of partition blocks occupied by $\{i, \dots, j\}$, which have an empty intersection with $\{i_1, \dots, i_l\}$.

After stating these counting principles, which we will use in the later proofs, we sum up some facts about pair partitions. We distinguish between *crossing* pair partitions and *non-crossing* pair partitions. A pair partition is said to be crossing if there exist indices $i < j < l < m$ with $i \sim l$ and $j \sim m$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{PP}(k) &\coloneqq \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(k) : \pi \text{ is a pair partition}\}, \\ \mathcal{CPP}(k) &\coloneqq \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(k) : \pi \text{ is a crossing pair partition}\}, \\ \mathcal{NCPP}(k) &\coloneqq \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(k) : \pi \text{ is a non-crossing pair partition}\}. \end{aligned}$$

For a non-crossing pair partition $\pi \in \mathcal{NCPP}(k)$ and $(P_1, \dots, P_k) \in S_n(\pi)$ we have

(NC1) There exist indices $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ with $i \sim j$ and $j = i + 1$.

(NC2) If $i \sim j$ and $j = i + 1$, we have $a_n(P_i) = a_n(P_j)$ and hence we have $\mathbb{E}[a_n(P_i)a_n(P_j)] = 1$. This is due to the fact that $i \sim i+1$ implies that for $P_i = (p_i, p_{i+1})$ and $P_{i+1} = (p_{i+1}, p_{i+2})$ we have $p_i = p_{i+2}$. Hence, by the symmetry of the considered matrix we have $a_n(P_i) = a_n(p_{i+2}, p_{i+1}) = a_n(P_{i+1})$.

(NC3) If $i \sim j$ and $j = i + 1$, the sequence $P' \coloneqq (P_1, \dots, P_{i-1}, P_{i+2}, \dots, P_k)$ is in $\tau_n(k-2)$. This is a consequence of (NC2).

(NC4) The number of non-crossing pair partitions on k elements is given by (see e.g. Lemma 8.9 in [6])

$$\#\mathcal{NCPP}(k) = C_{\frac{k}{2}},$$

where $C_k \coloneqq \frac{1}{k+1}\binom{2k}{k}$ denotes the k-th Catalan number.

With these notations and results about pair partitions we can continue with the calculation of (3.8).

4. Calculating the Expected k-th Moment of μ_n

We return to the expected k-th moment of the spectral distribution given in (3.8). In the following lemma, we show that summing over all non-crossing pair partitions in (3.8) equals $C_{\frac{k}{2}}$ under both (C1) and (C2). The contribution of the crossing partitions is studied in subsection 4.1 for condition (C1) and in subsection 4.2 for condition (C2).

Lemma 4.1 (cf. Lemma 5.2 and 5.3 in [9])**.** *Under condition (C1) and (C2) we have for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ even*

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{tr} X_n^k\right] = C_{\frac{k}{2}} + \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{CPP}(k)} \sum_{(P_1,\dots,P_k)\in S_n(\pi)} \mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_1)a_n(P_2)\dots a_n(P_k)\right] + o(1).$$

Proof. By successively applying (NC1)-(NC3) we have for any $\pi \in \mathcal{NCPP}(k)$ and $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi)$:

$$\mathbb{E}[a_n(P_1)\dots a_n(P_k)] = 1.$$

We claim that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\#S_n(\pi)}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} = 1, \quad \pi \in \mathcal{NCPP}(k). \tag{4.9}$$

Let $(P_1,\dots,P_k)$ be in $S_n(\pi)$. According to (NC1)-(NC3) we have $i \sim i+1$ for some $i \in \{1,\dots,k\}$ and $P' \coloneqq (P_1,\dots,P_{i-1},P_{i+2},\dots,P_k) \in \tau_n(k-2)$. Moreover, we have

$$P' \in S_n(\pi'),$$

where $\pi' \coloneqq \pi \setminus \{\{i,i+1\}\} \in \mathcal{NCPP}(k-2)$ and all $l \geq i+2$ are relabeled to $l-2$.

Thus, all possible $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi)$ can be constructed from a choice of P' and a choice of p_{i+1}. For p_{i+1} there are $n - \frac{k-2}{2}$ possibilities, as we have to ensure that $p_i + p_{i+1}$ does not equal any of the $(k-2)/2$ values $p_j + p_{j+1}$ for $j \neq i$, $j \neq i+1$. This implies

$$\frac{\#S_n(\pi)}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} = \frac{\#S_n(\pi')}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} + o(1).$$

The claim in (4.9) then follows by induction and the fact that for $k=2$ we have $\#S_n(\pi) = \{((p,q),(q,p)) : p,q \in \{1,\dots,n\}\} = n^2$. Statement (NC4) completes the proof. □

4.1. The expected k-th moment of μ_n under (C1).

In this subsection we assume that condition (C1) is satisfied and we show that for k even the expected k-th moment of μ_n is asymptotically given by $C_{\frac{k}{2}}$.

Lemma 4.2 (cf. Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 in [10])**.** *If (C1) is satisfied, we have for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ even*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{tr} X_n^k\right] = C_{\frac{k}{2}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.1 it suffices to show that for each $\pi \in \mathcal{CPP}(k)$ (recall that the number of these partitions depends on k only) we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{(P_1,\dots,P_k)\in S_n(\pi)} \mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_1)a_n(P_2)\dots a_n(P_k)\right] = 0.$$

Let $\pi \in \mathcal{CPP}(k)$. We will define related partitions $\pi^{(1)},\dots,\pi^{(r)}$ by successively deleting blocks of π such that we arrive at some partition $\pi^{(r)} \in \mathcal{CPP}(k-2r)$, for which adjacent elements $j, j+1$ are in different blocks. Suppose that $l \sim_\pi l+1$ for

some $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, otherwise we set $r = 0, \pi^{(r)} = \pi$. Then we obtain $\pi^{(1)}$ from π by deleting the block $\{l, l+1\}$

$$\pi^{(1)} \coloneqq \pi \setminus \{\{l, l+1\}\}$$

and relabeling all $j \geq l+2$ to $j-2$. Hence $\pi^{(1)} \in \mathcal{CPP}(k-2)$. Correspondingly, we delete P_l, P_{l+1} from $(P_1, \dots, P_k)$ to obtain (see (NC3))

$$(P_1, \dots, P_k)^{(1)} \coloneqq (P_1, \dots, P_{l-1}, P_{l+2}, \dots, P_k) \in S_n(\pi^{(1)}).$$

We repeat this procedure to obtain $\pi^{(2)}$ and $(P_1, \dots, P_k)^{(2)}, \pi^{(3)}$ and $(P_1, \dots, P_k)^{(3)}$, ... until we arrive at a partition $\pi^{(r)} \in \mathcal{CCP}(k-2r)$ where none of the blocks contains adjacent elements. Then $(P_1, \dots, P_k)^{(r)} \in S_n(\pi^{(r)})$. Since π is a crossing partition, at least two blocks of π remain after the elimination process and we have

$$r \leq \frac{k}{2} - 2.$$

Using the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.1 leads to the following estimate for given $(Q_1, \dots, Q_{k-2r}) \in \tau_n(k-2r)$:

$$\#\{(P_1, \dots, P_k) \in S_n(\pi) : (P_1, \dots, P_k)^{(r)} = (Q_1, \dots, Q_{k-2r})\} \leq n^r.$$

By (NC2) we have for $(P_1, \dots, P_k)^{(r)} = (Q_1, \dots, Q_{k-2r})$

$$\mathbb{E}[a_n(P_1) \dots a_n(P_k)] = \mathbb{E}[a_n(Q_1) \dots a_n(Q_{k-2r})]$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi)} |\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_1)a_n(P_2)\dots a_n(P_k)\right]| \\ \leq \quad & n^r \sum_{(Q_1,\dots,Q_{k-2r}) \in S_n(\pi^{(r)})} |\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(Q_1)a_n(Q_2)\dots a_n(Q_{k-2r})\right]|. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

We choose $i \sim_{\pi^{(r)}} i+j$ such that $j \geq 2$ is minimal. By Hölder's inequality we have for any s, t

$$|\mathbb{E}[a_n(Q_s)a_n(Q_t)]| \leq (\mathbb{E}[a_n(Q_s)^2])^{1/2} (\mathbb{E}[a_n(Q_t)^2])^{1/2} = 1$$

and hence, as k is even,

$$|\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(Q_1)a_n(Q_2)\dots a_n(Q_{k-2r})\right]| \leq |\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(Q_i)a_n(Q_{i+j})\right]| = |\mathrm{Cov}(a_n(Q_i), a_n(Q_{i+j}))|.$$

Inserting this estimate into (4.10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & n^r \sum_{(Q_1,\dots,Q_{k-2r}) \in S_n(\pi^{(r)})} |\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(Q_1)a_n(Q_2)\dots a_n(Q_{k-2r})\right]| \\ \leq\ & n^r \sum_{(Q_1,\dots,Q_{k-2r}) \in S_n(\pi^{(r)})} |\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(Q_i)a_n(Q_{i+j})\right]|. \end{aligned}$$

At this point, we would like to use

$$|\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(Q_i)a_n(Q_{i+j})\right]| = c_n(|q_i - q_{i+j}|), \tag{4.11}$$

then calculate the number of points $(Q_1, \dots, Q_{k-2r}) \in S_n(\pi^{(r)})$ for given q_i, q_{i+j} and finally use (C1) to obtain

$$\sum_{q_i, q_{i+j}=1}^{n} c_n(|q_i - q_{i+j}|) = o(n^2).$$

Unfortunately, (4.11) is only valid for $q_i \leq q_{i+1}$ and $q_{i+j} \leq q_{i+j+1}$ or for $q_i \geq q_{i+1}$ and $q_{i+j} \geq q_{i+j+1}$ where $Q_i = (q_i, q_{i+1})$ and $Q_{i+j} = (q_{i+j}, q_{i+j+1})$. Hence, we have to take the ordering of the q_i, q_{i+1} and q_{i+j}, q_{i+j+1} into account. As before, we denote

$Q_l = (q_l, q_{l+1})$ for $l = 1, \dots, k-2r$, where $k-2r$ is identified with 1. We distinguish two types of pairs (Q_i, Q_{i+j}): We call

$$(Q_i, Q_{i+j}) \begin{cases} \text{positive}, & \text{if } \operatorname{sgn}(q_i - q_{i+1}) = \operatorname{sgn}(q_{i+j} - q_{i+j+1}) \\ \text{negative}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Then we have

$$|\operatorname{Cov}(Q_i, Q_{i+j})| = \begin{cases} c_n(|q_i - q_{i+j}|), & \text{if } (Q_i, Q_{i+j}) \text{ positive} \\ c_n(|q_i - q_{i+j+1}|), & \text{if } (Q_i, Q_{i+j}) \text{ negative} \end{cases}.$$

We claim the following: For given q_i and q_{i+j} there are less than $n^{\frac{k}{2}-r-1}$ tuples $(Q_1, \dots, Q_{k-2r}) \in S_n(\pi^{(r)})$ with (Q_i, Q_{i+j}) positive. Similarly, for given q_i, q_{i+j+1} there are less than $n^{\frac{k}{2}-r-1}$ tuples $(Q_1, \dots, Q_{k-2r}) \in S_n(\pi^{(r)})$ with (Q_i, Q_{i+j}) negative. We start with the case (Q_i, Q_{i+j}) positive and q_i, q_{i+j} fixed. We have n possible choices for q_{i+1}. By $i \sim i+j$, this determines the value of q_{i+j+1} (recall q_{i+j} is fixed) and hence Q_i, Q_{i+j} are fixed. Since j is chosen to be minimal, the $j-1$ elements in $\{i+1, \dots, i+j-1\}$ lie in $j-1$ different partition blocks. Hence, we have n possibilities for each of the $j-2$ points $q_{i+2}, \dots, q_{i+j-1}$. So far, there were $n \cdot n^{j-2}$ possibilities and we fixed $Q_i, \dots, Q_{j+i}$. We want to apply counting principle (CP2) to determine the number of possible choices for the remaining pairs $Q_{i+j+1}, \dots, Q_{k-2r}, Q_1, \dots, Q_{i-1}$. Hence, we have to determine the number of partition blocks occupied by $i+j+1, \dots, k-2r, 1, \dots, i-1$, that have an empty intersection with the set $\{i, \dots, i+j\}$. From the total of $\frac{k}{2}-r$ partition blocks of $\pi^{(r)}$ one block is occupied by i and $i+j$ and the $j-1$ blocks occupied by $\{i+1, \dots, i+j-1\}$ each contain one element in $\{i+j+1, \dots, k-2r, 1, \dots, i-1\}$ as well. Thus, (CP2) gives $n^{\frac{k}{2}-r-1-(j-1)} = n^{\frac{k}{2}-r-j}$ possibilities to fix $Q_{i+j+1}, \dots, Q_{k-2r}, Q_1, \dots, Q_{i-1}$. Hence, for fixed q_i, q_{i+j} we have a total of

$$n \cdot n^{j-2} n^{(\frac{k}{2}-r-j)} = n^{\frac{k}{2}-r-1}$$

possibilities to choose $Q_1, \dots, Q_{k-2r}$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & n^r \sum_{\substack{(Q_1,\dots,Q_{k-2r}) \in S_n(\pi^{(r)}) \\ Q_i, Q_{i+j} \text{ positive}}} |\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(Q_i) a_n(Q_{i+j})\right]| \\ & \leq n^{\frac{k}{2}-1} \sum_{q_i, q_{i+j}=1}^{n} c_n(|q_i - q_{i+j}|) \leq n^{\frac{k}{2}} \sum_{\tau=0}^{n-1} c_n(\tau) = o(n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}) \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

by $\sum_{\tau=0}^{n-1} c_n(\tau) = o(n)$ (see (ii) in (C1)).

In the case (Q_i, Q_{i+j}) negative and q_i, q_{i+j+1} given, we have n possibilities to fix q_{i+1}, determining q_{i+j} by $i \sim j$. Hence, Q_i, Q_{i+j} are fixed and we can proceed just as in the case (Q_i, Q_{i+j}) positive and we obtain

$$n^r \sum_{\substack{(Q_1,\dots,Q_{k-2r}) \in S_n(\pi^{(r)}) \\ Q_i, Q_{i+j} \text{ negative}}} |\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(Q_i) a_n(Q_{i+j})\right]| = o(n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}) \tag{4.13}$$

Combining (4.12) and (4.13) leads to

$$n^r \sum_{(Q_1,\dots,Q_{k-2r}) \in S_n(\pi^{(r)})} |\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(Q_1) a_n(Q_2) \dots a_n(Q_{k-2r})\right]| = o(n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}),$$

completing the proof. □

4.2. **The expected k-th moment of μ_n under (C2).** Before we can proceed to study the large n-limit of

$$\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{CPP}(k)} \sum_{(P_1,\dots,P_k)\in S_n(\pi)} \mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_1)a_n(P_2)\dots a_n(P_k)\right] \tag{4.14}$$

under condition (C2), we state a combinatorial lemma needed for the proof. Throughout this section we write $P_i = (p_i, p_{i+1}), i = 1,\dots,k$. We want to pay special attention to pairs P_i, P_j with $i \sim j$ and

$$P_i = P_j \quad \text{or} \quad P_i = \overline{P}_j \coloneqq (p_{j+1}, p_j). \tag{4.15}$$

The lemma states that if a block $\{i,j\}$ of a partition π with (4.15) is crossed by some other block, the number of points $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi)$ is of order $o(n^{\frac{k}{2}+1})$.

Lemma 4.3 (Crossing Property, cf. Lemma 5.4 in [9])**.** *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\pi \in \mathcal{PP}(k)$ and $i < j$ with $i \sim j$. Set*

$$S_n(\pi, i, j) \coloneqq \{(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi) : P_i = P_j \text{ or } P_i = \overline{P}_j\}.$$

If there exist i', j' with $i' \sim j', i < i' < j$ and either $j' < i$ or $j < j'$ (i.e. the block $\{i,j\}$ is crossed by the block $\{i',j'\}$), we have

$$\#S_n(\pi, i, j) = o(n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}).$$

Proof. To construct $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi,i,j)$, first choose p_i and p_{i+1}, each allowing for n possibilities. Then P_i is fixed and we choose one of the two possibilities $P_i = P_j$ or $P_i = \overline{P}_j$, fixing P_j. Let r denote the number of partition blocks occupied by $\{i+1,\dots,i'-1\}\cup\{j,\dots,i'+1\}$. By similar arguments as in (CP1) we have less than n^r choices to fix $P_{i+1},\dots,P_{i'-1},P_j,\dots,P_{i'+1}$. Hence, $P_{i'}$ is determined by consistency without any further choice. So far, we fixed P_l for l in $r+2$ different partition blocks. By (CP2) there are at most $n^{\frac{k}{2}-r-2}$ choices to fix all remaining points P_l. In total, there are $n^{\frac{k}{2}}$ possibilities to construct $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi,i,j)$. □

We continue by considering the term in (4.14) and observe that for $\pi \in \mathcal{CPP}(k)$ and $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi)$ the term $\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_1)a_n(P_2)\dots a_n(P_k)\right]$ is a product of factors

$$\mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_i)a_n(P_j)\right] = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } P_i = P_j \text{ or } P_i = \overline{P}_j \\ c_n, & \text{else} \end{cases}, \quad i \sim j. \tag{4.16}$$

To account for this fact, we introduce the following notation for a given partition $\pi \in \mathcal{CPP}(k)$ and $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi)$:

$$m(P_1,\dots,P_k) \coloneqq \#\{1 \le i < j \le k : P_i = P_j \text{ or } P_i = \overline{P}_j\} \le \frac{k}{2}.$$

For $l \in \{1,\dots,\frac{k}{2}\}$ we set

$$A_n^{(l)}(\pi) \coloneqq \{(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi) : m(P_1,\dots,P_k) = l\}.$$

Hence, we can write for $\pi \in \mathcal{CPP}(k)$

$$\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{\substack{(P_1,\dots,P_k)\\ \in S_n(\pi)}} \mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_1)a_n(P_2)\dots a_n(P_k)\right] = \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{l=0}^{\frac{k}{2}} c_n^{\frac{k}{2}-l} \#A_n^{(l)}(\pi).$$

Moreover, we set

$$B_n^{(l)}(\pi) \coloneqq \{(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in S_n(\pi) : m(P_1,\dots,P_k) = l;$$
$$P_i = P_j \text{ or } P_i = \overline{P}_j, i < j \;\Rightarrow\; j = i+1 \text{ or } \pi|_{\{i+1,\dots,j-1\}} \text{ is a pair partition}\}.$$

By the crossing property of Lemma 4.3 we have

$$\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}}\#\left(A_n^{(l)}(\pi)\setminus B_n^{(l)}(\pi)\right)\to 0,\quad n\to\infty. \tag{4.17}$$

Indeed, any point $(P_1,\dots,P_k)\in\left(A_n^{(l)}(\pi)\setminus B_n^{(l)}(\pi)\right)$ belongs to some $S_n(\pi,i,j)$ and

$$\#\bigcup_{i,j\in\{1,\dots,k\}} S_n(\pi,i,j)=o(n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}).$$

In order to show that $n^{-(\frac{k}{2}+1)}\#B_n^{(l)}(\pi)$ vanishes for almost all values of l, we introduce the notion of *height* of a pair partition $\pi\in\mathcal{PP}(k)$:

$$h(\pi):=\#\{1\le i<j\le k, i\sim j : j=i+1 \text{ or } \pi|_{\{i+1,\dots,j-1\}} \text{ is a pair partition}\}.$$

Since

$$\big((P_i=\overline{P}_j) \text{ or } (P_i=P_j)\big)\quad\Rightarrow\quad i\sim j,$$

we have

$$B_n^{(l)}(\pi)=\emptyset\quad\text{for } l>h(\pi). \tag{4.18}$$

Combining (4.17) and (4.18) leads to

$$\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}}\sum_{l=0}^{\frac{k}{2}} c_n^{\frac{k}{2}-l}\#A_n^{(l)}(\pi)=\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}}\sum_{l=0}^{h(\pi)} c_n^{\frac{k}{2}-l}\#B_n^{(l)}(\pi)+o(1). \tag{4.19}$$

It is a consequence of the following lemma that only $B_n^{(h(\pi))}(\pi)$ gives a non-vanishing contribution in (4.19).

Lemma 4.4. *For $k\in\mathbb{N}$, $\pi\in\mathcal{PP}(k)$ and $l<h(\pi)$ we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}}\#B_n^{(l)}(\pi)=0.$$

Proof. Let $\pi\in\mathcal{PP}(k)$ and $l<h(\pi)$. We want to construct $(P_1,\dots,P_k)\in B_n^{(l)}(\pi)$. As we assume $l<h(\pi)$, there are indices i,j that give a contribution to $h(\pi)$ but the corresponding pairs P_i,P_j do not contribute to $m(P_1,\dots,P_k)$, i.e. there exist $1\le i<j\le k$ such that

(i) $i\sim j$,
(ii) $j=i+1$ or $\pi|_{\{i+1,\dots,j-1\}}$ is a pair partition,
(iii) $P_i\neq P_j$ and $P_i\neq\overline{P}_j$.

In particular, $j=i+1$ cannot be satisfied, as this implies $P_i=\overline{P}_j$. Hence, we can assume $j>i+1$, $\pi|_{\{i+1,\dots,j-1\}}$ is a pair partition (with $(j-i-1)/2$ blocks) and, as a consequence of (iii), $p_{i+1}\neq p_j$. We observe that

$$\#(\pi|_{\{1,\dots,k\}\setminus\{i+1,\dots,j-1\}})=\frac{k}{2}-\frac{j-i-1}{2}.$$

Then there are n possibilities to choose p_{i+1} and by (CP1) we have $n^{\frac{k}{2}-\frac{j-i-1}{2}}$ possibilities to successively choose $p_i,p_{i-1},\dots,p_1,p_k,\dots,p_j$. Applying (CP2) to choose $p_{i+2},\dots,p_{j-1}$ would amount to $n^{\frac{j-i-1}{2}}$ possibilities, but we claim that there are actually only $Cn^{\frac{j-i-1}{2}-1}$ possibilities. Recalling that p_{i+1},p_j are already known and distinct, we observe that we have

$$0\neq p_{i+1}-p_j=\sum_{s=1}^{j-i-1}(-1)^s(p_{i+s}+p_{i+s+1}). \tag{4.20}$$

As $\pi|_{\{i+1,\dots,j-1\}}$ is a pair partition, neglecting their sign, each term $p_{i+s}+p_{i+s+1}$ appears exactly twice in the alternating sum in (4.20) and as the sum does not

vanish, there are $1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq j-i-1$ with $i+\alpha \sim i+\beta$ and $(-1)^\alpha = (-1)^\beta$. Then we have

$$p_{i+1} - p_j = 2(-1)^\alpha (p_{i+\alpha} + p_{i+\alpha+1}) + \sum_{\substack{s=1,\dots,j-i-1 \\ s\neq\alpha,\beta}} (-1)^s (p_{i+s} + p_{i+s+1}). \tag{4.21}$$

For each of the $\frac{j-i-1}{2}-1$ blocks $\{r,s\} \subset \{i+1,\dots,j-1\}\setminus\{i+\alpha, i+\beta\}$ we assign one of $2n$ possible values to p_r+p_{r+1} (and hence to p_s+p_{s+1}), amounting to $(2n)^{\frac{j-i-1}{2}-1}$ possibilities. Then the alternating sum in (4.21) is fixed and as we already know p_{i+1}, p_j, we can calculate $(p_{i+\alpha}+p_{i+\alpha+1})$ and hence $p_{i+\beta}+p_{i+\beta+1}$. Knowing p_{i+1}, p_j and all the terms $p_l + p_{l+1}$, $l = i+1,\dots,j-1$, the values of $p_{i+2},\dots,p_{j-1}$ are uniquely determined. Hence, there was a total of

$$n^{\frac{k}{2}-\frac{j-i-1}{2}+1}(2n)^{\frac{j-i-1}{2}-1} = C_{i,j} n^{\frac{k}{2}}$$

possibilities to choose $(P_1,\dots,P_k) \in B_n^{(l)}(\pi)$, where $C_{i,j}$ denotes some constant that may depend on i and j only. Thus, we have

$$0 \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \# B_n^{(l)}(\pi) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} C_{i,j} \frac{n^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} = 0,$$

completing the proof. □

So far, we showed that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{CPP}(k)} \sum_{(P_1,\dots,P_k)\in S_n(\pi)} \mathbb{E}\left[a_n(P_1)a_n(P_2)\dots a_n(P_k)\right] \\ =&\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{CPP}(k)} c_n^{\frac{k}{2}-h(\pi)} \# B_n^{(h(\pi))}(\pi) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that we have by Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.3

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \# B_n^{(h(\pi))}(\pi) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \# \left(B_n^{(h(\pi))}(\pi) \cup \left(\bigcup_{l<h(\pi)} B_n^{(l)}(\pi) \right) \right) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \#\{\{(P_1,\dots,P_k)\in S_n(\pi) : \\ &\qquad P_i = P_j \text{ or } P_i = \overline{P}_j, i<j \Rightarrow j = i+1 \text{ or } \pi|_{\{i+1,\dots,j-1\}} \text{ is a pair partition}\}.\} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \# S_n(\pi) \end{aligned}$$

In order to state a result about the limit of $\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \# S_n(\pi)$, we introduce the notion of Hankel volumes.

Definition 4.5. For a pair partition $\pi \in \mathcal{PP}(k)$ we consider the set of equations in the $k+1$ variables $x_0,\dots,x_k \in [0,1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 + x_0 &= x_{l_1} + x_{l_1-1}, && \text{if } 1 \sim l_1 \\ x_2 + x_1 &= x_{l_2} + x_{l_2-1}, && \text{if } 2 \sim l_2 \\ &\dots \\ x_i + x_{i-1} &= x_{l_i} + x_{l_i-1}, && \text{if } i \sim l_i \\ &\dots \\ x_k + x_{k-1} &= x_{l_k} + x_{l_k-1}, && \text{if } k \sim l_k. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, as π is a pair partition, these are actually only $\frac{k}{2}$ equations. If $\pi = \{\{i_1, j_1\}, \{i_2, j_2\}, \dots \{i_{\frac{k}{2}}, j_{\frac{k}{2}}\}\}$ with $i_l < j_l, l = 1, \dots, \frac{k}{2}$, we solve the equations for $x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_{k/2}}$, determining a cross section of the cube $[0,1]^{\frac{k}{2}+1}$. The volume of this cube is denoted by $p_H(\pi)$. It is a result of [7] that $p_H(\pi)$ is exactly the limit of $\frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \# S_n(\pi)$.

Proposition 4.6 (Lemma 4.8 in [7]). *For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\pi \in \mathcal{PP}(k)$ we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \# S_n(\pi) = p_H(\pi).$$

Finally, using that under (C2) we have $c_n \to c$ as n tends to infinity, we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{tr} X_n^k\right] &= C_{\frac{k}{2}} + \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{CPP}(k)} c^{\frac{k}{2}-h(\pi)} p_H(\pi). \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{PP}(k)} c^{\frac{k}{2}-h(\pi)} p_H(\pi) =: M_k. \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

The second equality is due to the fact that all statements in subsection 4.2 remain valid for all pair partitions that are not necessarily crossing.

5. The Proofs of Theorem 2.2, Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.4

To complete the proof of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 we need to show that, with probability one, the empirical spectral distribution converges weakly to a non-random limit under (C1) resp. under (C2). Under condition (C1) the limiting measure is Wigner's semi-circle μ (see (2.4)), which is uniquely determined by its moments: the odd moments vanish and the $2k$-th moment is given by the k-th Catalan number C_k (see e.g. Section 2.1.1 in [1]). If (C2) is valid, we will see that the limiting measure v_c is determined by its moments

$$\int x^k dv_c = \begin{cases} 0 & k \text{ odd} \\ M_k & k \text{ even} \end{cases}. \tag{5.23}$$

The fact that these moments uniquely determine v_c can be verified by checking the Carleman condition.

Remark 5.1. From (4.22) and (5.23) we can already deduce the following facts about the measure v_c:

(i) The measure v_0 is the semi-circle distribution. Indeed, for $c = 0$ we have $M_k = C_{k/2}$ for k even, which are exactly the moments of the semi-circle distribution.
(ii) The measure v_1 equals γ_H, as $M_k = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{PP}(k)} p_H(\pi)$ for $c = 1$, which are exactly the moments of γ_H (cf. [7]).
(iii) The measure v_c is symmetric for all $c \in [0,1]$ because all odd moments vanish.
(iv) For $0 < c \leq 1$ the measure v_c has unbounded support. Indeed, as a bounded support of v_c would lead to $M_{2k} \leq C^{2k}$, it suffices to verify

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} (M_{2k})^{\frac{1}{k}} = \infty.$$

The above relation is a consequence of $c^{\frac{k}{2}} \int x^k d\gamma_H(d) \leq M_k$ and (see Proposition A.2 in [7]) $\limsup_{k\to\infty} (\int x^{2k} d\gamma_H(d))^{1/k} = \infty$.

We can now prove Theorems 2.2 and 2.3, which read:

Theorem 5.2. *Let μ be Wigner semi-circle given in (2.4) and let v_c be the measure that is uniquely determined by its moments according to (5.23).*

(i) Under condition (C1), μ_n converges for $n \to \infty$ weakly, with probability one, to μ .

(ii) Under condition (C2), μ_n converges for $n \to \infty$ weakly, with probability one, to v_c.

Proof. We will use the concentration inequality obtained in Proposition 4.9 in [7], which can easily be extended to the case of matrices with independent skew-diagonals analogue to Lemma 3.5 in [10]. Hence, we have under both conditions (C1) and (C2)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\operatorname{tr}(X_n^k) - \mathbb{E}(\operatorname{tr}(X_n^k))^4\right)\right] \leq Cn^2, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.24}$$

As the limiting distributions μ and v_c are uniquely determined by their moments, it suffices to show

$$\int x^k d\mu_n(X_n) = \frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}(X_n^k) \to \mathbb{E}[Y^k], \quad n \to \infty \quad \text{almost surely,}$$

where Y denotes a random variable distributed according to v_c if we consider (C2) and according to μ if we consider (C1). By Chebyshev's inequality and (5.24) we have for $\varepsilon > 0, k, n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}(X_n^k) - \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}(X_n^k)\right)\right| > \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^4 n^2}.$$

By the Borel-Cantelli Lemma we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}(X_n^k) - \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}(X_n^k)\right) \to 0 \quad n \to \infty \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Since it is the result of the previous sections that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{tr}(X_n^k)\right) \to \mathbb{E}[Y^k], \quad n \to \infty,$$

this completes the proof. □

It remains to prove the claims about the limiting measure v_c, which are listed in Theorem 2.4. Some of those are already stated in Remark 5.1 and it suffices to show the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.3 (cf. Lemma 6.2 in [9])**.** *With the notation of Theorem 2.4 we have*

$$v_c = v_{0,1-c} \boxplus v_{1,c}, \quad 0 \leq c \leq 1.$$

Moreover, v_c has a smooth density if $0 \leq c < 1$.

Proof. Recall that $v_{0,1-c}$ denotes the rescaled semi-circle with variance $1 - c$ and $v_{1,c}$ the rescaled Hankel distribution γ_H with variance c as derived in [7]. It suffices to show that the free cumulants of the free convolution of $v_{0,1-c}$ and $v_{1,c}$ coincide with the free cumulants of v_c. We apply the same arguments as in Lemma 6.2 in [9] (only replacing p_T by p_H), that rely on the results of Lemma A.4 in [7] (see also p. 152 in [6]). Similarly, we conclude

$$(1-c)^k \kappa_{2k}(\mu) + c^k \kappa_{2k}(\gamma_H) = \kappa_{2k}(v_c),$$

proving

$$v_c = v_{0,1-c} \boxplus v_{1,c}, \quad 0 \leq c \leq 1.$$

Using general results about the free convolution with the semi-circle distribution provided in [4], we obtain that v_c has a smooth density for $0 \leq c < 1$. □

Remark 5.4. The boundedness of the density of v_c is not derived here as the boundedness of γ_H is not yet available in the literature. Note that for matrices with independent diagonals the boundedness of the corresponding density could be derived in [9], using [4] and the boundedness of γ_T [17].

As already noted, our line of arguments follows [9, 10] and in the following concluding remark we comment on the differences between the proofs.

Remark 5.5. The main difference between the ensembles considered here and those considered in [9, 10] is that instead of (3.5) the dependence structure of the matrix entries in [9, 10] is given by

$$|p_i - q_i| = |p_j - q_j| \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad i \sim j.$$

Hence, the validity of all arguments from [9, 10] has to be verified for (3.5).

The proof of Theorem 2.2 follows the corresponding proofs in [10]. Here, we do not introduce the sets $S_n^*(\pi) \subset S_n(\pi)$ (there is actually no natural way to do this in our setting), and all needed relations have to be derived from (3.5) directly. The lack of S_n^* requires the distinction of positive and negative pairs in the proof of Lemma 4.2.

The proof of Theorem 2.3 (corresponding to [9]) requires more modifications. Again, we do not introduce the sets $S_n^*(\pi)$, but in this case the implications are more severe. The most prominent one is that the analogue of [10, Lemma 5.5] is not valid and it has to be replaced by Lemma 4.4 of this paper (i.e. $\#B_n^{(l)}(\pi)$ is not necessarily zero for all n but vanishes in the limit $n \to \infty$), which required new ideas. Moreover, in Section 4.2 we have to additionally consider the pairs $\overline{P}_j$ in the definition of $S_n(\pi, i, j)$ in Lemma 4.3, in (4.16) and in all derived terms such as $m(P_1, \ldots, P_k)$ and $B_n^{(l)}(\pi)$. Hence, we have to verify that the required estimates remain valid.

In both cases, the extension from the convergence of the expected k-th moment to the almost sure convergence and the proof of Theorem 2.4 can be carried out analogously to [9, 10].

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Matthias Löwe for drawing her attention to the subject of this paper and for many fruitful discussions.

References

[1] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet, and O. Zeitouni. *An Introduction to Random Matrices*. Cambridge University Press, 1 edition, December 2009.

[2] L. Arnold. On Wigner's semicircle law for the eigenvalues of random matrices. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, 19:191–198, 1971.

[3] Z. D. Bai. Methodologies in spectral analysis of large-dimensional random matrices, a review. *Statist. Sinica*, 9(3):611–677, 1999. With comments by G. J. Rodgers and Jack W. Silverstein; and a rejoinder by the author.

[4] P. Biane. On the free convolution with a semi-circular distribution. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 46(3):705–718, 1997.

[5] A. Boutet de Monvel, A. Khorunzhy, and V. Vasilchuk. Limiting eigenvalue distribution of random matrices with correlated entries. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 2(4):607–636, 1996.

[6] M. Bożejko and R. Speicher. Interpolations between bosonic and fermionic relations given by generalized Brownian motions. *Math. Z.*, 222(1):135–159, 1996.

[7] W. Bryc, A. Dembo, and T. Jiang. Spectral measure of large random Hankel, Markov and Toeplitz matrices. *Ann. Probab.*, 34(1):1–38, 2006.

[8] L. Erdős. Universality of Wigner random matrices: a survey of recent results. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 66(3(399)):67–198, 2011.

[9] O. Friesen and M. Löwe. A phase transition for the limiting spectral density of random matrices. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 18:no. 17, 17, 2013.
[10] O. Friesen and M. Löwe. The Semicircle Law for Matrices with Independent Diagonals. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 26(4):1084–1096, 2013.
[11] F. Götze, A. Naumov, and A. Tikhomirov. Semicircle Law for a Class of Random Matrices with Dependent Entries. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2012.
[12] F. Götze and A. Tikhomirov. Limit theorems for spectra of random matrices with martingale structure. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 51(1):42–64, 2007.
[13] W. Hochstättler, W. Kirsch, and S. Warzel. Semicircle law for a matrix ensemble with dependent entries. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2014.
[14] A. M. Khorunzhy and L. A. Pastur. On the eigenvalue distribution of the deformed Wigner ensemble of random matrices. In *Spectral operator theory and related topics*, volume 19 of *Adv. Soviet Math.*, pages 97–127. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.
[15] A. Nica and R. Speicher. *Lectures on the combinatorics of free probability*, volume 335 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
[16] J. H. Schenker and H. Schulz-Baldes. Semicircle law and freeness for random matrices with symmetries or correlations. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 12(4):531–542, 2005.
[17] A. Sen and B. Virág. Absolute continuity of the limiting eigenvalue distribution of the random Toeplitz matrix. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 16:706–711, 2011.
[18] T. Tao and V. Vu. Random matrices: universality of local eigenvalue statistics. *Acta Math.*, 206(1):127–204, 2011.
[19] T. Tao and V. Vu. Random matrices: The Universality phenomenon for Wigner ensembles. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2012.
[20] E. P. Wigner. Characteristic vectors of bordered matrices with infinite dimensions. *Annals of Mathematics*, 62(3):pp. 548–564, 1955.
[21] E. P. Wigner. On the distribution of the roots of certain symmetric matrices. *Annals of Mathematics*, 67(2):pp. 325–327, 1958.

Inst. for Math. Stat., Univ. Münster, Orléans-Ring 10, 48149 Münster, Germany
E-mail address: kristina.schubert@uni-muenster.de